

F 153
.A21
Copy 1

ADDRESS

OF THE

DEMOCRATIC YOUNG MEN

231
467

OF THE

CITY AND COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA,

TO THEIR

REPUBLICAN FELLOW CITIZENS

THROUGHOUT THE

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADELPHIA—1823.

F153

A21

MS 12 Oct 09

ADDRESS.

AT a very numerous meeting of the Democratic Young Men of the City and County of Philadelphia, held on the 22d July, 1823, we were appointed to prepare and publish an address to our republican fellow citizens throughout the Commonwealth, in relation to the approaching election for Governor.

While discharging the duty thus imposed, we cannot but be deeply sensible of the dignity of the subject. A great state, deriving its power as well from the intelligence of its people, as from the properties of its soil, is called upon to choose, freely and deliberately, its chief executive magistrate.

Two candidates are before us; and we respectfully ask your attention while we plainly present some of the inducements, which, with a force that we think cannot be resisted, urge the republicans of Pennsylvania, to support the election of JOHN ANDREW SHULZE.

In the *first* place, it is highly important at this time, that the supremacy of sound political principles should be secured by the triumph of the Democratic party. It is exceedingly convenient for those who oppose us on this question, to cant about the propriety of sinking into oblivion, the old party distinctions; to boast of the approach of an epoch from which may be dated the diffusion of more liberal principles; and to urge the election of their candidate upon the plausible ground, that the only questions to be considered in his administration, are those which can be determined by a simple reference to the general welfare. For our parts, we confess that we not only distrust, but that we utterly disbelieve such professions. We appeal from the empty declamations of political partisans, to the sober experience of our country. The Federal party, mistaking violence for strength, and the efforts of imbecility for the results of a prudent foresight, were deservedly prostrated before the indignant majesty of the people. The direct path to power being thus irrevocably barred, more secret, and of course more dangerous expedients are necessarily employed. The pure current of political opinion which swept away the bulwarks of their party, cannot be rolled back by open resistance—but the tide may be diverted from its na-

tural direction, and made to waste its energy in a thousand useless rivulets. Hence the policy of federalism is to weaken and divide—to foment the jealousy of the discontented and lull the vigilance of the wary—for they wisely calculate that as victory was only achieved by a vigorous and unanimous effort, it can only be maintained by corresponding activity. Wherever success has partially attended them, they have demonstrated the hollowness of their professions and the illiberality of their principles. If they obtained the control of a state, they thwarted and opposed, both in Peace and in War, the wise and patriotic exertions of the general government. If they procured the management of a still smaller political body, they exhibited a narrow spirit, unworthy of an enlightened people, and pursued a proscriptive system, disgraceful in a liberal age. We can no more give faith to the declarations of the Federal party as to their future conduct, than we can admire their past career. And while we deny the *feasibility* as well as the *sincerity* of their proposals, we call upon the republicans of this great republican state, to do their duty to themselves, to their party, and to their country.

But do you inquire whether the stability of the democratic party is really at stake in the ensuing contest. We answer, not only its stability, but its very existence is in jeopardy. Is it not the public boast of many of the federal leaders that if they succeed in this election the democracy of the state will, in the loss of its preponderance, receive its death blow? The point of time has arrived at which the struggle must be finally determined. Do you ask us whether the triumph of republican principles is identified with the success of Mr. Shulze? Ask yourselves who are his supporters. Are they not your political friends? And who are his opposers? Do you not notice the federalists gathering around their party banner and combating against him with all the keenest weapons of political strife? Look to that great engine of power, a free press, and observe whence it receives its momentum, and how it again acts upon the community. Do not all the presses which are patronized by republicans, and which you acknowledge to be the supporters of republican principles, vigorously support his election? And do not all those which owe their existence to federal patronage, and have acquired the federal character, bitterly abuse him? Notwithstanding the unmanly effort of his opposers to assume a new party name, the distinction is drawn too clearly for equivocation itself to deny. The supporters of Mr. Shulze constitute the republican family of the state, and his opposers are the trained and organized federal party.

From this view of the subject it would seem, that whatever might have been the original nomination of Mr. Shulze, he has been so completely adopted by the democratic party as their candidate, that it is now the duty of every man, who does not wish for the triumph of federalism, to give him his decided support. But an investigation of that point will result in the conviction that he was, in the first instance, fairly, freely, and regularly nominated. The convention

which met at Harrisburg, was the most numerous that ever assembled for a similar purpose. It contained many of the most venerable and enlightened men of the state, who had been chosen by their republican fellow citizens, in their respective counties, after full public notice, and for the express purpose of choosing a candidate. This convention selected Mr. Shulze, and unanimously recommended him to the republicans of the commonwealth. It was to be expected that the federal party would impeach the motives and misrepresent the conduct of this respectable body. That expectation has been fulfilled; but the cordiality with which the republicans greeted the nomination, and the efficient support which they continue to extend to it, demonstrate their belief in the purity of the views, and the uprightness of the proceedings of the convention of the 4th of March.

In the *second* place, we urge you to the support of Mr. Shulze, on account of his own fitness for the office of Governor. The strong good sense, and the plain republican habits of the people of Pennsylvania, lead them to look for a man who unites in himself, in a high degree, the characteristics by which they are themselves distinguished.

They wish for a man of a clear intellect, useful education, sound principles, and an accurate knowledge of the true policy of the state; and when they have found such a man, possessing too, a practical experience in public business, they are not to be diverted by party manœuvres, from designating him as the man of their choice. That Mr. Shulze is such a man, we have the strongest reason to believe. We have the testimony of the convention which nominated him. We have the experience of his whole life, passed before his fellow citizens, the history of which has been open to the severe scrutiny of a censorship, so rigid that the slightest blemish would not have escaped its observation. His private career has been so dignified and moral, that all the bitterness of opposition has not ventured to assail it. His public conduct has been so upright, so intelligent, and so patriotic, that notwithstanding the ardor, the ingenuity, and the effrontery with which it has been attacked, it stands before his country identified with the principles of the republican party, and defensible upon the strictest grounds of the constitution and the laws.

What then, it may be asked, are the objections to his election? It is our duty to notice the most prominent of these, and we enter upon the task with the full confidence, that when fairly stated and distinctly understood, they will be pronounced by all who are not blinded by prejudice, utterly groundless.

In relation to one event, misrepresentation attempted to taint the purity of his character. We allude to the circumstance of his having, in early life, left the sacred desk, for which he had been classically educated, and which he honorably filled to mingle with the world. Believing as we do, in the general integrity of his life, we care not to inquire into the reasons by which he was governed. We notice the topic, only because we consider the charge founded upon it, to

be the dictate of an unusual profligacy in politics, and because a simple assertion of the fact, which is too well known to be now even denied, that a severe bodily affliction compelled Mr. Shulze to change his occupation, is amply sufficient to refute and to repel the unmanly imputation.

But the objections to Mr. Shulze's conduct as a legislator are urged with more plausibility. The amount of them is, that he is an *enemy to the Constitution*. Upon this point, we plainly and broadly *deny the allegation*, and are ready to meet the proofs.

There are *three* questions upon which, it is alleged, he has by his votes, violated sound constitutional principles. We refer, in the *first* place, to the bill which was made a law, last winter, directing the payment of certain debts to certain banks; in the *second* place, to the bill, entitled, "A bill further to restrain aldermen and justices of the peace from taking cognizance of suits against military officers;" and in the *third* place, to the bill in relation to St. Mary's Church.

It would occupy too much time to enter into a full and detailed argument upon each of the points suggested, but we propose to make some remarks which we think will aid you in arriving at a just conclusion.

It costs nothing, to talk about attacks upon the *constitution*, and infringements of *chartered rights*. Misrepresentation has only to be supported by a heedless effrontery, in order to mislead the opinions of those, who readily listen to what is loudly proclaimed, and are content to believe what is frequently repeated. But it belongs to the character of those who delight in truth, to examine and understand the groundwork of accusation, before they yield their assent to the confidence of broad assertion, or surrender their judgments to the unblushing boldness of empty declamation.

First, then, as to the STATE DEBTS. What is the brief history of the case? Under an act of assembly, monies were borrowed upon the condition of their being reimbursed within four years, and the faith of the Commonwealth was pledged *by that law*, for the performance of the condition. The constitution requires the governor to "take care that the *laws* be faithfully executed." Hence it was thought to be the duty, as it had been in like cases, the practice of the Governor, to direct the State Treasurer to reimburse such monies within the time specified. It so happened that the Governor did not give such direction in the present case, and the faith of the Commonwealth stood unredeemed. A bill was passed, which, after briefly setting out the facts, directed the Governor to draw warrants on the Treasurer for the sums of money thus owing and unpaid. The bill was returned by the Governor with his objections. It was reconsidered, and then passed by the constitutional majority of *two thirds* in each house, and thus became a law. Such are the facts. It was objected, that the preamble of the bill recognized a construction of the law authorising the loan, not warranted by that part of the

constitution, which declares that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." It had been considered by former governors and former legislatures, and it is considered by the present legislature, that the very law contracting to pay the debt within a limited period, and pledging the faith of the Commonwealth therefor, contained the appropriation required by the constitution, and that it remained with the executive "to take care that the law was faithfully executed." There is certainly nothing alarming in this opinion. Mr. Shulze voted for the bill in question, and if he erred at all in his views, he erred with many of the most enlightened men of the state. In opposing him on this ground, you censure a long established practice of your republican administration, and condemn the conduct of successive republican legislatures. The ground of objection then, utterly fails.

In the *next* place, as to the MILITIA QUESTION. *Misunderstanding* upon this subject has been industriously excited, and widely extended. We will endeavour to exhibit the *truth*. The right of *trial by jury* is secured by the constitution. Various laws have been from time to time enacted, enlarging the jurisdiction with justices of the peace exercised at the date of the constitution. It has been questioned, whether these laws did not encroach upon the right of the trial by jury, and they have been acquiesced in, only because by means of an appeal, a party to a suit before a justice is enabled to obtain such a trial. But it never was honestly contended, that a law which directs a party, complaining of an injury, to apply for redress, immediately to a jury of the land, is in violation of any constitutional provision. By the 69th section of the militia law of April, 2d, 1822, it is declared that no court, or Alderman, or Justice of the Peace, within the Commonwealth, shall take cognizance of *appeals* that may be offered or attempted from any sentence or decree of a court of appeal or court martial, held under the laws of this state, or of the United States, *provided*, that nothing in said act shall impair the provisions of the act for the better securing personal liberty and preventing wrongful imprisonments, passed in 1785, and known by the name of the habeas corpus act. The same section declares, that *all suits that may be brought against any person or persons for any thing done in pursuance of the act, shall be commenced and tried in the county where the cause of action shall have arisen, and not elsewhere*. By the 81st section of the act, the former laws on this point were repealed. And here an opportunity offers for explaining from what circumstances the public mind has been agitated and confused on this subject. The general militia law of 1814, contained provisions similar to those we have just quoted. But by a supplement passed on the 19th of March, 1816, it was declared "that no action of trespass shall be sustained in any *court of record* within this Commonwealth, in consequence of any proceedings had by any courts martial or courts of appeal." This highly obnoxious, absurd, and unjust provision, was, with the whole supplement containing it, re-

pealed by the 60th section of the militia law of April 2, 1821; and so careful have the legislature been never to re-enact it, even by implication, that when they repealed, by the act of 1822, the law of 1821, they expressly provided, that *nothing therein contained should be construed to revive* any former law or laws which by the said act of 1821 had been repealed.

Thus stood the law last winter. The bill in favour of which Mr. Shulze voted, and which passed the Senate, but was not acted upon in the House of Representatives, simply declared that no alderman or justice of the peace should take cognizance of any *civil* suit against any constable, collector, or any other person, concerned in the execution of the militia laws for any thing done by him under or in pursuance of said laws.—And how did it leave the question? The party seeking redress was permitted to apply as before to *the court of the county where the cause of action arose*, and considering the nature of the case, the courts are certainly the appropriate tribunals. The avenues to the temple of justice were continued wide open to him, and a *jury of his peers* was to sit in just judgment on his case. IT IS NOT TRUE as has been ignorantly asserted, that this bill would have placed the *military* above the *civil* power, and that a citizen suffering under the oppression of a collector of fines, was to be deprived of all redress.

The law had before given a remedy, either before a court of common law, or a justice of the peace. The bill in question went very judiciously to take away the jurisdiction of the justice, and to leave so serious a business to the constitutional trial by jury. Under the law as now settled by acts of Assembly and judicial decisions, it is believed that no possible difficulty could arise from the cause of actions not exceeding one hundred dollars—and even if any were suggested, the party might lay his damages at what sum he pleased, and thus bring his suit. Thus it is, that though Mr. Shulze voted as sound policy dictated, and the constitution allowed, and as the majority of his colleagues had done, a violent clamour is raised against him, and amidst the confusion, the people are to be tricked into the sacrifice of both candour and truth.

In the *third* place—as to the CATHOLIC bill. No pains have been spared to impress a belief that, on this subject, the conduct of Mr. Shulze has been inconsistent with the character of the representative of a free people: and yet upon no question of legislative concern, can purity of motive and uprightness of action be more satisfactorily demonstrated. The original charter of “the members of the religious society of Roman Catholics belonging to the congregation of St. Mary’s,” granted in 1788, had provided that the trustees of the corporation should consist of the *pastors* of the church, duly appointed, not exceeding *three* in number, and of *eight lay members* of the congregation, and that the eldest pastor present at any meeting, should be president of the board.

The bill which was reported to the Senate by a committee, on the 29th January last, provided in its first section, that the corporation

should thereafter consist of *eleven members* of the congregation, and that the trustees should choose their own president. It was this section only, which excited extreme bitterness of feeling, and which was considered in the first instance by either of the parties to the church dispute, as in any manner striking at the full and free exercise of the right to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of conscience. The great innovation proposed to be made upon the charter was, that *none* of the trustees *need be pastors*, and it was objected that the peculiar faith and discipline of the Roman Catholic church would be violated by such an innovation. Whatever may be the opinions of men upon this disputed point, the belief has been industriously circulated that Mr. Shulze voted in favour of the innovation. We will not enter into the question whether even if Mr. Shulze had thus voted, that is to say, had acted with those who contend that the Legislature have the power to pass the section referred to, and that the "peace, safety and happiness" of the people require its exercise, his conduct could in that case be defended. But we appeal to the record which conclusively evinces, that Mr. Shulze is charged with having done one thing, when he did directly the reverse, and which demonstrates beyond the reach of cavilling, that he voted with the majority of the Senate, against the very law, out of which it was alleged the violation of chartered rights would spring. The Journal of the Senate is the record we refer to, and it shows (page 481) that upon the question "Will the Senate agree to the said first section?" the votes were, YEAS 7—NAYS 21: and that Mr. Shulze voted in the *negative*. But it is said that Mr. Shulze was one of the committee who first considered the subject, and that in the committee, he voted to report the whole bill. Whether he did or not we pretend not certainly to know, but we assert without the fear of contradiction, that a vote in committee on the question of reporting or not reporting a bill, is never considered in legislative usage as affording any evidence of opinion on the bill itself. It is in fact considered illiberal to strangle a contested bill in committee, and thus prevent its having a chance with the house. If Mr. Shulze then, did vote as suggested, he only acted with his accustomed fairness. Now we have to ask, that *truth* shall be allowed its proper influence; and we feel persuaded that every man, even the most rigid catholic, who has been led into error, by bold assertions, will candidly and honourably acknowledge his mistake.

We have thus accomplished the review of the objections to Mr. Shulze's legislative career; and we leave it to the honest judgment of his republican fellow citizens to decide, whether instead of deserving reprehension, he is not entitled to their cordial applause.

It remains for us to say something of the candidate by whom he is opposed; and here we protest against that mode of political discussion, which has for its basis only personal invective, and gross misrepresentation. We will treat Mr. Gregg with the respect due to his years. We shall not charge him with being either 'a traitor

to his God—or his country.—Such epithets bespeak the vulgarity, while they demonstrate the political despair of those who employ them. But the objections to Mr. Gregg's being placed in the executive chair, are numerous and to us conclusive.

And here we recur to our preceding remarks touching the views of the federal party. The same reasons which induce us to support the election of Mr. Shulze as necessary to the triumph and security of sound political principles, lead us to oppose any man who is brought into view in opposition to him. This argument would not be impaired in its force, even by the fact that the man opposing him, could be himself called a republican. The mere fact of a continued and open opposition to the ascertained views and wishes of the democratic party, so far places the individual out of the pale of that party, that, for all the purposes of the question in dispute, he is not to be considered as belonging to them. Whether Mr. Gregg then be entitled to the mere name of a democrat or not, cannot effect the case. He is content to aim at overthrowing the settled plans of the republican party, and he must be content to meet the whole power by which they can resist him.

But if these objections were not sufficient, we could find others in the conduct which Mr. Gregg has for many years pursued. If he had acted upon sound political principles, the party which has uniformly maintained such principles would certainly have adhered to him. But the truth is, that party has "weighed him in the balance and found him wanting." They discarded him, and he then openly combatted against them. The federal party adopted and supported him, and the republicans were arrayed against him, and sometimes defeated him. Do you ask for the proof of all this.—What was his conduct concerning Jay's treaty? By his influence and vote as a member of Congress, he aided the views and measures of the leading federalists, in defiance of the well settled and understood judgment of the sages of democracy. If at a subsequent period, he was trusted by the republicans of his district, it only served to give him additional opportunities of demonstrating that he was unworthy of the honours they conferred, and in 1806 we find that he had been utterly and finally excluded from their trusts. At the congressional election of that year, in the counties of Northumberland, Centre, Clearfield and Lycoming, he was supported by the federalists in opposition to Daniel Montgomery, jun. the democratic candidate, and defeated by the republican votes. From that time to the present day, he has had none of the confidence, and been permitted to take no part in the deliberations of the republican party. The justice of this treatment, was confirmed by his subsequent conduct as a public officer. Amid the divisions which unhappily paralyzed the republican party in 1807, he was elected to a seat in the Senate of the United States, in opposition to the regular republican candidate, and by the aid of the whole body of the federalists in the legislature. Nor did he fail to give new evidence of the infection

naturally to be expected from an association with federalists. Upon the great WAR QUESTION, which afforded the touchstone of party feeling in 1812, and upon which the republicans acted with one heart and one mind, he exerted the influence which his station commanded, in thwarting and counteracting the wise, spirited and patriotic views of the general government. Yet, although openly discontented with the proceedings of the executive, he had not the firmness to resist them by his vote, but with a moral cowardice that must ever be despised in a public functionary, he shrunk from the responsibility of opinions which he wished others to adopt, and finally voted contrary to that judgment which he professed to have conscientiously formed. "*Let no such man be trusted.*" If he had been deceived in his views of public advantage, and had fearlessly acted in pursuance of those views, we should lament the darkness which clouded his judgment, but must yield him the praise of consistency and firmness. But when we see him vacillating between his duty as a representative, and a slavish desire of personal popularity, between the calls of conscience and the suggestions of interest, and finally assisting by his vote a measure which he believed to be wrong, merely because it promised to favour his individual advantage, we are compelled to pronounce him unworthy of our confidence, and to pray that the destinies of the state may never be entrusted to so unsteady a hand.

Let us hear no more about Mr. Gregg's uniform democracy. We may well reject that democracy which has only federalism for its advocate, and we are not to be swerved by the abuse of a name.

There is one other view of this subject which we wish to impress strongly upon your minds. In case of Mr. Gregg's election, the substantial and enlightened republicans of the state will be excluded from all influence in her administration, and the seats of the cabinet, and the offices of the counties will be necessarily occupied by high toned federalists in whom you have never reposed your faith, and whom you are not disposed to see exalted. That such must be the consequence of his election, no man can honestly deny, who is acquainted with the workings of the human mind. That Mr. Gregg should advance those who raised him to power, and pass by those who opposed his elevation, is too much in accordance with all human experience to be now disputed.

In conclusion, we would appeal to the patriotism and virtue of our democratic youth. If those who surpass us in years and experience, who having completed their measure of public usefulness, must soon be removed from the political arena, are deeply impressed with the importance of the crisis, and resolved to devote their best energies to the republican cause;—how much more deeply should it be felt by us, who may yet look forward to a length of days, depending entirely for their comfort and respectability on the safety and purity of our free institutions. With how much eagerness should we grasp at the means of advancing our country in her

race of glory ; with how much indignation should we repel the first blow, that is aimed at her prosperity. The bounty of Heaven and the wisdom of man, have singularly conspired to bless and adorn her—but both will have been exerted in vain, if we forget to cherish the maxims and preserve the practice of genuine republicanism. The moment we depart from the path they prescribe, we commence a pilgrimage of danger and difficulty. We scatter the rich blessings, which our fathers accumulated, and leave desolate the temple they erected to liberty.

We observe that the late signal victory which the republicans have gained in the state of Massachusetts, is chiefly ascribed to the patriotic exertions of the rising generation. If example were necessary to stimulate your efforts, we would point you to this, as worthy of imitation, in the full confidence that Pennsylvania may preserve her rank among her sister states, by a similar display of youthful energy. But the simple fact, is amply sufficient, that the state in which we reside, can never discharge her duty to herself and to the union, unless her administration be decidedly republican—and that the existence of such an administration can only be secured by the election of Mr. Shulze.

S. RUSH,
GEO. W. RITER,
ROBERT COOPER,
T. M. PETTIT,
JOHN THOMPSON, jun.
HENRY S. COXE,
KENDERTON SMITH,
GEO. W. JONES,
JOHN D. GOODWIN,
I. P. KENNEDY.

Philadelphia, July 31, 1823.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 312 392 3

